

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA
CHARLOTTE DIVISION
CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:17-CV-265-MOC-DCK**

RONALD CALVIN WILLIAMS,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	<u>ORDER</u>
)	
STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA; NC STATE)	
BOARD OF ELECTIONS; NORTH CAROLINA)	
DEPARTMENT OF SECRETARY OF STATE,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

THIS MATTER IS BEFORE THE COURT on “Plaintiff’s Request For Pre-Trial Conference & To Expedite” (Document No. 25) and “Plaintiff’s Withdrawal Of Motion To Expedite” (Document No. 29). These motions have been referred to the undersigned Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b), and immediate review is appropriate. Having carefully considered the motions and the record, the undersigned will allow the *pro se* Plaintiff’s motion to withdraw his previous motion to expedite.

In addition, the Court will allow Plaintiff a brief extension of time to file a reply brief in support of his pending motion for summary judgment, and deny “Plaintiff’s Motion” (Document No. 21). “Plaintiff’s Motion” appears to seek leave to amend the caption of the case (and/or the Complaint) *if* the Court rules against him on the pending motion to dismiss. (Document No. 21, p.1). The undersigned finds that “Plaintiff’s Motion” is not properly supported and should be denied without prejudice. See Local Rule 7.1 (A)–(C).

IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED “Plaintiff’s Request For Pre-Trial Conference & To Expedite” (Document No. 25) is **DENIED AS MOOT**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that “Plaintiff’s Withdrawal Of Motion To Expedite” (Document No. 29) is **GRANTED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that “Plaintiff’s Motion” (Document No. 21) is **DENIED** **WITHOUT PREJUDICE**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Court will *sua sponte* grant Plaintiff an extension of time until **September 27, 2017**, to file a reply brief in support of his motion for summary judgment. See Local Rule 7.1 (E).

SO ORDERED.

Signed: September 18, 2017



David C. Keesler
United States Magistrate Judge 